

Serial No.: 10/803,292

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO CLAIM 13

Claim 13 is objected to due to informalities. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner initially indicates that the phrase "primary viewing windows" in claim 13 is not clearly defined or shown. Applicants respectfully submit that the meaning of "primary viewing windows" is clearly understood by those having ordinary skill in the art in view of the description in the present application as well as the related art.

For example, the present application describes primary viewing windows 10, 11 of a parallax barrier display in connection with the related art shown in Fig. 1. The present application goes on to describe the primary viewing windows in connection with the parallax barrier display of the present invention as recited in claim 13. As is readily apparent, the primary viewing windows refer to the main or primary-order windows as compared to the higher-order windows produced by the parallax barrier.

The Examiner also indicates that it is not clear in claim 13 how the geometric equation relates to the primary viewing windows. Applicants note that claim 13 recites how the "first pitch b_1 is given by: $b_1 = p/(1 \pm p/e)$, where p is the pitch of the columns and e is the pitch of primary viewing windows produced by the display". Referring to Figs. 1 and 8 of the present application, for example, "e" is clearly shown as the pitch of the primary viewing windows 10, 11. Applicants further note that "p" is clearly shown as being the pitch of the columns of pixels of the pixel plane 3.

Thus, the first pitch b_1 recited in claim 13 is defined as a function of the pitch of the primary viewing windows and the pitch of the columns of pixels. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 13 does clearly set forth how the equation relates to the primary viewing windows.

Serial No.: 10/803,292

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claim 13.

II. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-24 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Isono et al.* Claims 10-14 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Isono et al.* in view of *Moseley et al.* Finally, claims 15 and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Isono et al.* in view of *Moseley et al.*, and further in view of *Taniguchi*. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

A feature of the present invention as defined in claims 1 and 10, for example, is a parallax barrier including a plurality of substantially opaque regions defining a plurality of groups of parallel slits. Specifically, each group includes N of such slits where N is an integer greater than one. The slits of each group are spaced apart with a first pitch b1 in a direction perpendicular to the slits. The groups are spaced apart with a second pitch b2 in the direction perpendicular to the slits. The second pitch b2 is greater than N.b1.

In rejecting claims 1 and 10, the Examiner admits that *Isono et al.* does not expressly teach the slits of each group being spaced apart in the manner recited in the claims. However, the Examiner appears to argue that Fig. 6D of *Isono et al.* shows a variable pitch upon which the parallax barrier of claims 1 and 10 would read. The Examiner then goes on to argue that one having ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to modify the variable pitch barrier described in *Isono et al.* so as to result in the particular spacings recited in claims 1 and 10.¹

Applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner's brief dismissal of the particular spacings recited in claims 1 and 10 as being either taught by or obvious in view of *Isono*

¹ Somewhat confusingly, the Examiner appears to take the position that the variable spaced barrier in Fig. 6D of *Isono et al.* in fact shows the particular spacings recited in claims 1 and 10 (thus, anticipating such feature of claims 1 and 10); however, the Examiner then goes on to argue it would have been obvious to modify the particular spacing shown in *Isono et al.* so as to result in the spacing recited in claims 1 and 10 (thereby suggesting that the Examiner does not feel that Fig. 6D of *Isono et al.* teaches exactly what is claimed). Clarification is requested.

Serial No.: 10/803,292

et al. The applicants go into great detail in the present application with regard to the benefits and detriments of different types of spacing arrangements in the prior or related art. The applicants have arrived at the particular spacing of the present invention as overcoming many of the detriments associated with the previous techniques while providing significant advantages.

Referring specifically to Fig. 6D of *Isono et al.*, the variable pitch barrier appears to show continuously varying spacing between adjacent slits. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion of a plurality of groups of slits wherein each group includes slits spaced apart by a first pitch b_1 . Furthermore, Fig. 6D of *Isono et al.* does not show the plurality of groups of slits being spaced apart at a second pitch b_2 where b_2 is greater than $N.b_1$ as recited in claims 1 and 10. Thus, Figs. 6D of *Isono et al.* does not teach the invention of claims 1 and 10.

Moreover, the particular spacing reciting in claims 1 and 10 would not have been obvious in view of Fig. 6D of *Isono et al.* As noted above, the spacing in accordance with the present invention provides distinct advantages and overcomes the detriments associated with previous arrangements for parallax barriers. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Isono et al.* which would motivate a person having ordinary skill in the art to alter the variable pitch barrier shown in Fig. 6D so as to result in the claimed invention.

Discussing now in more detail, *Isono et al.* describes a three-dimensional image display of an image with the parallax barrier system by electrically generating a parallax barrier so as to obviate the need for special glasses. (See, e.g., Col. 1, Ins. 8-18). Specifically, this is achieved by electronically and variably controlling the appearance and disappearance of a parallax barrier. (See, e.g., Col. 2, Ins. 31-39).

The display section 100 as disclosed in *Isono et al.* includes two liquid crystal display panels 28 and 46 and an image enlarging section 56 of a transparent material arranged in between the panels 28 and 46. The light from a light source 52 is irradiated to the panel 46 from the backside of the panel 46. The image displayed on the panel 46 is either a two-dimensional (2D mode) image, a three-dimensional (3D mode) image or a mixture of 2D and 3D image ((2 + 3)D mode) mixedly displayed.

Serial No.: 10/803,292

Furthermore, Isono describes that a parallax barrier is electrically and programmably displayed on the whole screen of the panel 28 in the 3D mode and a portion of the screen in the (2 + 3)D mode. Examples of such parallax barrier generated are shown in Figs. 7A, 7B and 7C of *Isono et al.* Figs. 6A, 6B and 6C are examples of the parallax barrier generated on the screen of the panel 28 according to the number of view points. Additionally, in a special case, a barrier of a variable pitch can be also generated as shown in Fig. 6D (referred to by the Examiner). (See, e.g., Col. 4, Ins. 55-57).

Thus, *Isono et al.* merely mentions that in a special case, a barrier of a variable pitch can be also generated. However, *Isono et al.* does not teach or suggest any specific examples/configurations of the variable pitch barrier that can be generated or any associated advantages.

In contrast, claims 1 and 10 teach specific configurations of groups of parallel slits. Specifically, "said slits of each said group being spaced apart with a first pitch b1 in a direction perpendicular to said slits and said groups being spaced apart with a second pitch b2, in said direction perpendicular to said slits, greater than N.b1". The associated advantages of these distinguishing features include making it possible to provide a parallax barrier which is suitable for use in multiple view displays having relatively wide viewing angles between viewing regions, reduced crosstalk between windows, increased brightness, etc. (See, e.g., Spec., p. 10, Ins. 25-29).

Moseley et al. and/or *Taniguchi* do not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in *Isono et al.*

As a result, *Isono et al.* taken alone or in combination with *Moseley et al.* and/or *Taniguchi* does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1-24. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-24 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.


Serial No.: 10/803,292

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP


Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: October 26, 2005

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
B:\GENIYAMA\Yamap913\yamap913.amd.wpd